

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/515,978	02/25/2000	Gerald M. Benson	55250USA1A	9164	
32692	7590 03/27/2003				
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY			EXAMINER		
PO BOX 334 ST. PAUL, N	127 AN 55133-3427		CHEVALIER, ALICIA ANN		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1772	14	
			DATE MAILED: 03/27/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/515,978	BENSON ET AL.
rianicity riessess	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alicia Chevalier	1772
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 20 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice) a timely filed amendment which	cation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set fort later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF T	ng date of the final rejection. THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding am the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the ma	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension or originally set in the final Office action: or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI 		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) 🛛 they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se	reconsideration has been consecutive consecution structure consecution structure consecutive consecuti	sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8,15-23 and 38-40</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 9-14 and 2	<u>4-37</u> .	
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is		proved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer		·
 10.□ Other:	(9)	
. Palent and Trademark Office		



Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendments to claims 16, 20 and 40 do not reflect the changes discussed during the telephonic interview, *March 3, 2003, and therefore raises new issues requiring a novel search and further consideration.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are drawn to a proposed claim amendment which is not being entered; thus, the arguments are not commensurate in scope with the claims.

HAROLD PYON

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER